

U.S. Appln. Serial No. 10/512,047
Amendment Dated: April 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action Mailed: December 15, 2005
Attorney Docket No.: 038665.55525US

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1-2.

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 6-12, as set forth in Item 7 on page 5 of the Office Action. In particular, the latter claims would be allowable if amended to overcome the formal grounds of rejection and rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, in view of the amendments set forth above, and the remarks set forth hereinafter, applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-12 are now allowable.

Claims 2-12 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention, based on certain formal issues cited in Item 4 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. In response to these grounds of rejection, applicants have amended claims 2-12 in a manner which addresses and is believed to resolve each of the recited formal issues. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Langdon et al. (GB 2 265 514 A) in view of Rees (U.S. Patent No. 6,034,760). However, for the reasons articulated in greater detail below, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5 and 13 are now allowable.

In the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance of claims 6-12, the Office Action indicates that the prior art fails to teach or suggest a laser

vibrometer for identify remote targets comprising, in combination with the other recited elements, either a phase-locked loop which includes a summing amplifier that sums signals generated by a plurality of low pass filters and outputs a signal to an integrator, or an autocovariance processor with multiple inputs, in which the signal derived from the multiple inputs is representative of the remote target, substantially unaffected by laser speckle. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite that the signal processor means comprises "an autocovariance processor having multiple inputs for combining said outputs of the receivers to produce a signal representative of the remote target and for removing laser speckle." (Claim 1; claim 13 has been similarly limited.) Accordingly, claims 1 and 13 are now believed to be allowable. Since claims 2-5 all depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, those claims are believed to be allowable as well.

In response to the objection to the drawings set forth in Item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, applicants have submitted replacement sheets in which appropriate labels have been inserted into the diagram blocks.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

U.S. Appln. Serial No. 10/512,047
Amendment Dated: April 17, 2006
Reply to Office Action Mailed: December 15, 2005
Attorney Docket No.: 038665.55525US

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #038665.55525US).

Respectfully submitted,

April 17, 2006



Gary R. Edwards
Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
GRE:aw

2752374